40th section of the Metropolitan Buildings Act, ought to declare whether the building on which he reports is, or is not, ruinous and dangerous to passengers, and if in his opinion it be ruinous and dangerous to passengers, then whether a general or partial repair is necessary, and will be sufficient for the safety of passengers; and if a partial repair, what part described generally ought to be repaired, or whether a total or partial pulling down is necessary for the safety of passengers, and if a partial pulling down, what part, described generally, ought to be pulled down. And we do hereby find, and certify, and award, that the building in question, that is to say, the house, No. 15, Field-lane, Holborn, is ruinous and dangerous to passengers; and that it is necessary for the safety of passengers to pull down the same." The costs to be paid by Mr. Pearson.

THICKNESS OF WALLS.

With regard to certain additional rooms or stories now in progress at Middlesex Hospital, Charles-street, Marylebone, the district surveyor of Saint Marylebone lodged an information to the effect that "the external walls forming the external inclosures of the said rooms were carried up of the thickness of one foot two inches, instead of the thickness of one foot six inches, the said rooms forming portions of the said hospital, which is a building of the third, or public class, and ought to have walls of the thickness for the extra rate of the first or dwelling-house class."

The referees' award was:—"That the irregularity referred to in the said information had been committed, but inasmuch as the height of the story is not more than ten feet, and the thickness of wall such as the official referees would have authorized, if special application had been made to them in this matter before the works were begun, we make no direction thereon."

EXEMPTION OF BUILDINGS BELONGING TO RAILWAY OR DOCK COMPANIES.

With regard to a dwelling-house for the secretary of the Great Western Railway Company, now being erected by Messrs. Locke and Needham, on land belonging to the company, adjoining the railway at Paddington, the surveyor of the Paddington district gave notice of certain irregularities, which the builders refused to amend, on the ground that the house was included in the list of buildings exempted from supervision in schedule B, part 2, of the Act, which concludes with the following paragraph:—"And the buildings and structures belonging to any other dock or railway authorized to be erected by any Act of Parliament."

The district-surveyor thought otherwise, and contended—first, that the 46th section of the Act 1 Victoria, cap. 92, providing that the exemption therein contained of certain buildings of the said company, from the rules and regulations contained in the statute, passed in the fourteenth year of the reign of his late Majesty King George 3 (cap. 78), should not apply to any dwelling house which might be erected on the land of the said company, was still in force.

Secondly; that schedule B, part 2, contained in the Act first-above mentioned, applies only to such buildings and structures as had been exempted by Act of Parliament, from the operation of the said Act of the fourteenth year of George 3.

Thirdly; that the said schedule B, part 2, did not apply to dwelling houses.

Lastly; that even if the said schedule B, part 2, did apply to any dwelling houses, it applies only to such dwelling houses as are within, and in connection with, the works of the said company's railway: that a residence for the company's secretary is not a dwelling-house of that description, and the more so, as the building in question was an isolated residence out of the line of the railway, in direct communication with the public way, and not separated therefrom, or from adjoining property by any wall, and might at any time be appropriated to the use of some person totally unconnected with the railway.

On the part of the company it was urged:—

First, That the said Act of the 14th year of Geo. 3rd having been repealed, so far as it related to the construction of buildings, and 46th section of the said Act, 1 Vict. c. 92, became inoperative.

Secondly, That the provisions of the said Schedule B, part 2, were to be read independently of, and without reference to, the enactments of any railway Act passed previously to the statute first above mentioned, (the Metropolitan Buildings Act).

Thirdly, That the said Schedule B, part 2, applies to buildings of all classes, and consequently to the dwelling-house in question.

Lastly, That the clause "within and in connection with the works," contained in the said Schedule B, part 2, applies only to the buildings of the London and Birmingham Railway Company, and ought not, nor ought the effect thereof, to be imported into the last and concluding paragraph of that Schedule; but that even if the said clause, or the effect thereof, ought to be so imported, still the building in question would be within the said Schedule B, part 2, inasmuch as it was built for the use of a permanent officer of the Great Western Railway Company, in direct communication with the line of the railway, and upon ground held by them, and which they were authorised by Act of Parliament to purchase.

The award was as follows:—

"That such buildings and structures only as are erected, or to be erected, by the Great Western Railway Company, within and in connection with the works of their railway, by virtue of the several Acts of Parliament relating thereto, are within the meaning of the said Schedule B, part 2, and exempt from the supervision prescribed by the said Act.

And inasmuch as the building in question was and is built by the last-mentioned company, upon land which they were empowered by Act of Parliament to purchase and use for the works of their railway; and inasmuch as it immediately adjoins such works and the line of the last-mentioned railway, and communicates with the railway by a private way, and does not adjoin any other building not in the occupation of the said last-mentioned company, and is to be used as a residence for the secretary of the said last-mentioned company, the same is for the present, and so long as it may continue to be used for that purpose, to be deemed to be erected within and in connection with the works of the said last-mentioned railway.

And that the said building in question is within the meaning of the said Schedule B, part 2, and exempt from supervision under the Metropolitan Buildings Act, 7 & 8 Vict., cap. 84."

Costs to be paid by the parties in equal moieties, the case being one of reasonable doubt.

ORIGINAL WORKING DRAWINGS OF STRASBURG CATHEDRAL.

We are glad to be able to lay before English readers the substance of a statement recently issued by Dr. Schneegans, relative to the publication of the ancient plans of Strasburg Cathedral.

In a period where the monuments of mediæval architecture have become objects of general attention and admiration—where every thing connected with old Christian art is matter of studious inquiry,—the research of architects and archæologists has been greatly directed towards those plans and drawings, made by mediæval masters, which are to be met with in several places of Europe. Amongst those, certainly, the collection preserved in the *Frauenhaus* of Strasburg claims the first rank, as well on account of the high signification of the monument to which they refer, as the number of the plans, and the great artistical worth which many of them possess. They consist of eighteen geometrical plans and elevations, drawn on parchment—mostly relating to the *western façade* of the dome, as begun in 1277 by Master Erwin von Steinbach, and completed by his worthy follower, Hans Hültz von Köln, in 1439. All these drawings are of the highest import to the history of the building of that part of the sublime (*hehren*) monument. Besides, they afford the best explanation on the many additions and changes, which the original plan of Erwin had to undergo by the hands of later directors (*Werkmeister*), and contribute, therefore, towards explaining the extraordinary form which the exhibits—even so through those changings of the original plan; a feature which, it is true, has been already passingly noticed in some works, but never yet properly expounded, explained, and proved. The front of the minster, as it appears now to the beholder, exhibits a composition and combination (*Verschmelzung*) of five different plans, belonging to as many architects and epochs. It is therefore a subject exceedingly interesting—not only as regards the history of the building of the minster itself, but also as one connected with the history of mediæval architecture in general, to account (what has not been done hitherto) for those changes made in Erwin's original plan, and, as far as possible, to point out those masters and epochs, to whom the several parts of that monument are to be ascribed.

In this respect, therefore, as we have said before, those ancient, venerable building-plans (*Bauriss*) are worthy of especial attention. They afford the most tangible and surest data towards the art-endeavours of those mediæval masters, as well as the means and the manner in which these masters made their plans and executed their drawings—and are, therefore, the best documents of the historical development of German architecture, from the second half of the thirteenth, to the beginning of the sixteenth century. It is true, that these ancient drawings have been dilated upon on several occasions; still always only in a general point of view, mostly not in a way to satisfy the true student. It is Professor Görres, who has the merit of having given first a general notice of them in his spirited essay on the Strasburg Minster, published in the *Heidelberg Jahrbücher*.

For the sake of giving a general outline of these plans, we have to class them into several departments. The oldest date from Erwin's times, and some of them, there is no doubt, are made by the hand of the immortal architect himself. They consist of—1. The sketch of the left side of a façade, which, although it corresponds with the general features of that, as it exists now, differs *entirely* in the character of its details. 2. The inner view of the two lower stories (*Stockwerke*) of the Erwin façade. 3 and 4. Two plans relating to the latter.—To these oldest drawings succeed 5 and 6, of nearly a similar character, which seem to be of the same date as the former, being, however, sketches of another master, much inferior to Erwin. Then follow the more recent plans. 7. A ground plan, containing every thing from the foot of the façade up to the pyramids. 8. The largest plan—on a parchment scroll of twelve feet length, shewing the whole middle portion of the façade up to the middle of the present platform; also a sketch of the *campanile*, placed between the postaments of the door made by Erwin, by which the façade was raised a whole story; but also that incomparable proportion between height and breadth, as well as the harmony of the single parts, materially impaired. This change in the plan of Erwin dates from the second half of the 14th century. 9. A nearly valueless plan of the south portion of the present façade. Then follow the plans relating to the present high steeple. 10. Is the most interesting of all—viz. the plan of the whole steeple structure, from the platform to the crown. In the lower parts, and up to the end of the four winding staircases, now over-built with little turrets, the plan exhibits the structure as it exists now. But thence, to the present spire or pyramid, it shews us the original plan. 11, 12, 13 are plans relating equally to the steeple. The remaining drawings comprehend single parts of the building, and constructions made after the completion of the steeple. 15 and 16 are the elevation and plan of the splendid pulpit, built in 1485 by Master Hans Meyger, or Hammer. 17, is a coloured view of the organ, and 18 is the plan of the so-called Lorenzen *Vorbaues* (addition), erected from 1494 to 1505, by Master Jacob von Landshut. To this already rich collection is to be added—19, an elevation of the steeple like that of the *Frauenhaus*, shewing up to the staircases the present building; thence, however, an earlier project of a pyramid, adorned with the colossal statue of Mary, with the infant. This original plan is the property of one of the Paris architects.

The above summary catalogue may suffice, at present, to shew the great importance of the

For a comprehensive guide on OCR and PDF Compression go to our website